

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application prior to the above amendment.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the October 4, 2005 Official Action and for previously contacting Applicant's representative regarding the status of the application. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for reconsidering and withdrawing the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of the claims in the prior Official Action.

In the Official Action, claims 1-4, 6-8 and 10 are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the message routing system set forth in U.S. Patent No. 6,675,507 to Bobo (hereinafter "Bobo '507"). Claims 5 and 9 stand rejected under 35 §103(a) as being obvious over Bobo '507 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,699,458 to Sprague. Claims 11-13, 15-18 and 20 stand rejected under §103(a) over Bobo '507 in view of another messaging routing system of Bobo's set forth in U.S. Patent No. 6,350,066 (hereinafter "Bobo '066"). Lastly, claims 14 and 19 were rejected under §103(a) over Bobo '507 in view of Bobo '066 and in further view of Sprague.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for the comprehensiveness of his rejections and reasons therefor. In the Action, Figures 4A and 4B of Bobo '507 are cited, as well as portions of the Specification (cols. 9 and 10) and claims 21-23, as support for the obviousness rejection of the claims over the message routing system of Bobo '507. Applicant respectfully submits that Bobo '507 fails to disclose the elements of claims 1 and 2, particularly, the requirement that the first page of a transmitted document be full size and subsequent pages be thumbnail images. In particular, the "fourth option" in Bobo '507, set forth therein in Figure 4A and at col. 9, lines 18-29 and col. 9, line 66 to col. 10 line 14, dictates that the incoming document in its entirety is sent to the user both in full size and in thumbnail, creating two HTML images for each page. See also claims 21 and 23 in Bobo. The fifth option is to send full-size HTML images of every page. Various other options and features are described in Bobo directed to other ways to present data to a user, albeit none in the fashion of the present invention. In like manner, Bobo '066 and Sprague also operate outside of the claimed invention, describing other inventions, and neither cures the deficiencies of the primary reference cited, Bobo '507.

Nonetheless, in view of Bobo's failure to recite the claimed invention, the Official Action rejects the claims as being an obvious variant of the techniques set forth in Bobo et al.

As set forth in the Specifications and Drawings, the present invention is instead directed to a document imaging platform system and method for capturing, transmitting, storing, retrieving and displaying documents in a shared-system environment using the Internet or other network. The present invention utilizes thumbnail images along with full images to facilitate transmission of multipage documents and to avoid transmission bottlenecks. The present invention thereby improves document transfer times and alleviates storage problems by taking advantage of the smaller file size required to store thumbnail images. Additionally, the present invention employs a hierarchically-based document security scheme with user and administrator controls to secure the documents.

For example, claim 1 currently recites a document image management system and a user display device for displaying a stored document, with the central database forwarding the document to the user display device pursuant to a given user query. Claim 1 further recites that the document contains a plurality of images, with the first of the images being a full image and the remainder of the images being thumbnail images, whereby when a user of the user display device selects a given thumbnail image from the remaining plurality of images, the central database forwards the full image corresponding to the given thumbnail image. Method claim 2 includes steps employing similar elements therein.

The practical and visualization advantages of the present invention over Bobo et al. are manifest, and the utter failure of these cited references to disclose or suggest the present invention, as claimed in claims 1 and 2 et al., is remarkable. As noted, the present invention provides a benefit to the user and a tool to best review multi-page documents stored remotely in a central database: forward only the first page in full format, in view of the user's explicit request for the document, and only thumbnails of subsequent pages, which have yet to be requested. Bobo et al. entirely fail to address this beneficial activity because these references are directed to systems that forward telephonic messages and facsimiles within a message storage and delivery system (MSDS). Indeed, Bobo and its ilk, directed to retrieving a stored document and converting the entire document into another format (or two), are entirely

different than the present invention, as claimed, which efficiently retrieves a stored document as needed. Hence, different focuses, different concerns and different disclosures. Both Bobo references focus entirely on routing, particularly telephonic messages. Sprague is directed to techniques for physically encoding thumbnail images from full images, i.e., transferring the bits therein, and adds nothing to the overall paradigm of Bobo, rendering any combination thereof defective.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bobo '507, Bobo '066 nor Sprague, alone or in combination, render the instant invention, as claimed, unpatentable. Bobo et al. are each directed to different technological concerns than those of the claimed invention and do not render the instant invention, as claimed, obvious because of some general similarity in handling data. The entire specification, figures and claims of the Bobo references are directed solely to message routing, and Sprague, directed to digitization of images, fails to cure the many deficiencies of the Bobo references, including the primary reference cited, Bobo '507.

Applicant has reviewed the various portions of the references noted in the Official Action, but feels that the claims are readily distinguishable over the cited references, as argued above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed inventions, i.e., claims 1-20, are allowable over the cited references. Applicant thus requests that the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 §U.S.C. 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. An early and favorable Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. In the event

that the Examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephone or personal interview will facilitate allowance of one or more of the above claims, the Examiner is courteously requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ray Van Dyke", written over a horizontal line.

Raymond Van Dyke  
Registration No. 34,746

Customer Number: 22204

**NIXON PEABODY LLP**  
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 585-8000 – Telephone  
(202) 585-8080 – Fax

RVD/JAP